DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 204 AC 004 054

Survey of Summer Institute Participants.
Colorado Univ., Boulder. Extension Division.
Pub Date 68
Note-17p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.95
Descriptors-*Adult Basic Education, *Employment Opportunities, *Inservice Teacher Education, *Institutes (Training Programs), Statistical Data, *Summer Programs, Surveys

A survey of the participants in the National Summer Institutes for Teacher Trainers in Adult Basic Education held at the University of Colorado in 1966 and 1967, aimed at determining the extent to which institute participants were being employed to provide instructional leadership in local programs. Questionnaires were sent to 114 participants in the two institutes. In December, 1967 a followup letter and another copy of the questionnaire were sent to individuals who had not responded to the first request. Responses were received from 85% of the participants. Employment opportunities for 1967 participants were better than they were for those of 1966. There tends to be considerable variation among states in the non-employment of participants in both summer institutes. Montana, Utah, and Wyoming fared best in 1966-67 with only a small percentage of respondents indicating no teaching assignment. These percentages increased in the year 1967-68: for example, Colorado, which had no unemployed respondents from the 1967 summer institute, had 13% in the academic year 1967-68. (nl)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO EXTENSION DIVISION
BUREAU OF CLASS INSTRUCTION
ADULT BASIC EDUCATION STAFF SPECIALIST PROJECT
1165 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302

SURVEY OF SUMMER INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS

April, 1968

During the fall of 1967 a survey of the participants in the National Summer Institutes for Teacher Trainers in Adult Basic Education held at the University of Colorado in 1966 and 1967 was undertaken. Information in three rather specific areas was sought to determine the impact of the programs on adult basic education in DHEW Region VIII and to provide data to assist in the improvement of instruction for future continuing education programs for adult basic education teachers. First, it was felt data was needed on the actual employment of former participants in local adult basic education programs. Up until this time there was no data to indicate the extent to which institute participants were being employed to provide instructional leadership in local programs. In addition, it seemed that information concerning subjects taught and instructioanl levels also would be useful.

Second, because the basic concept of the National Summer Institutes of 1966 and 1967 was to provide training for individuals who would participate as leaders in the in-service training of other adult basic education teachers in their own communities, information was sought concerning the extent to which former participants had been involved in this kind of activity. And finally, questions were included to elicit the perceptions former participants have of their needs for additional training in adult basic education.

A questionaire was distributed on November 30, 1967 to the 114 participants in the 1966 Summer Institute and the 73 persons in the 1967 program. A follow up letter and another copy of the questionnaire was sent in December 1967 to individuals who had not responded to the first request. A total of 159 responses were received amounting to 85% of all participants. A copy of the questionnaire is to be found on pages 16 and 17 of this report.

Table 1 shows the numbers and percentages of all participants in both summer institutes by states in Region VIII. The "other states " category includes participants from states outside of Region VIII. In 1966 participants in summer institute training from Alaska were assigned to the Region VIII program. It was felt that the unique needs of Alaskan teachers more closely paralleled those to be found in Region VIII particularly in relation to educating adult American Indians. This category for 1967 included participants from Arizona, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas and Washington.

TABLE I

PARTICIPANTS IN SUMMER INSTITUTES
BY STATES

State	SUMMER INSTITUTE					
	1966		1967		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Colorado	45	39.5	15	20.5	60	32.1
Idaho	9	7.9	5	6.9	14	7.5
Montana	13	11.4	7	9.6	20	10.9
Utah	18	15.8	6	8.2	24	12.8
Wyoming	21	18.4	7	9.6	28	15.0
Other States	8	7.0	33	45.2	41	21.7
Total	114	---	73	---	187	---

Table 2 shows the numbers and percentages of respondents to the questionnaire by states for both summer institutes. Comparing tables 1 and 2 shows that participants responded in close proportion to their representation in the Institutes by states.

TABLE 2

RESPONDENTS BY STATES AND
SUMMER INSTITUTE

State	Summer Institutes					
	1966		1967		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Colorado	32	35.6	15	21.8	47	30.2
Idaho	8	8.9	5	7.2	13	7.4
Montana	13	14.4	6	8.7	19	12.0
Utah	13	14.4	6	8.7	19	12.0
Wyoming	19	21.1	5	7.2	24	15.1
Other States	5	5.6	32	46.4	37	23.3
Total	90	---	69	---	159	---

Table 3 adjusts the proportions of respondents to include only those from Region VIII. This produces some shifts in relative proportions with Colorado showing the largest increase in respondent from the 1967 institute in relation to its proportion of the total number of participants. This is accounted for by the fact that nearly one half of the respondents who attended the 1967 institute came from states outside Region VIII. Excluding this group (32 individuals) nearly doubles the percentages of participants from Region VIII states that year.

Table 3

Respondents By Region VIII States
and Summer Institutes

State	SUMMER INSTITUTES					
	1966		1967		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Colorado	32	37.6	15	40.6	47	38.5
Idaho	8	9.4	5	13.5	13	10.7
Montana	13	15.3	6	16.2	19	15.6
Utah	13	15.3	6	16.2	19	15.6
Wyoming	19	22.4	5	13.5	24	19.6
Total	85	---	37	---	122	---

The first item on the questionnaire dealt with employment in Adult Basic Education during the present school year. Table 4 shows the number and percent of respondents by summer institutes who indicated that they had no assignment at the time they filled out the questionnaire. It is interesting to note that the proportions of respondents who attended the 1966 Summer Institute and who did not have an adult basic education assignment at the time they filled out the questionnaire is almost five times as great as it is for those who were in the more recent program. Table 5 shows the distribution and percentages of respondents indicating no assignment this academic year in adult basic education by states for both the 1966 and 1967 programs with percentages based on the total number of respondents from each state.

TABLE 4

NO ASSIGNMENT IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION IN 1967-68*

SUMMER INSTITUTE	NUMBER	%
1966	48	53.3
1967	10	11.1

*As of December, 1967

TABLE 5

NO ASSIGNMENT IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION IN 1967-68 by STATES*

State	SUMMER INSTITUTE			
	1966		1967	
	Number	%	Number	%
Colorado	17	53.1	2	13.4
Idaho	4	50.0	0	---
Montana	6	46.1	2	33.3
Utah	4	31.0	0	---
Wyoming	13	68.4	1	20.0
Other States	4	80.0	5	15.6

*Percentages based on the number of respondents from each state. Data as of December, 1967.

Forty one percent of the respondents from the 1966 summer institute indicated that they did have an adult basic education assignment at the time they filled out the questionnaire while the proportion of respondents from 1967 was 69.5 percent. Table 6 shows this data by types of agency from which employment was secured for both programs.

TABLE 6

EMPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF AGENCY
in 1967-68*

AGENCY	SUMMER INSTITUTE					
	1966		1967		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Bureau of Indian Affairs	0	---	2	4.2	2	2.4
Bureau of Prisons	1	2.7	3	6.3	4	4.7
Community/Junior College	2	5.4	0	0	2	2.4
College	2	5.4	3	6.3	5	5.9
University	1	2.7	1	2.1	2	2.4
Migrant Council	1	2.7	0	---	1	1.2
O.E.O.	3	8.1	3	6.3	6	7.1
Hospital	1	2.7	0	---	1	1.2
Publishing Company	0	---	1	2.1	1	1.2
School District	26	70.3	32	66.7	58	68.2
State Education Agency	0	---	3	6.3	3	3.5
M.D.T.A.	0	---	0	---	0	---
Total	37	---	48	---	85	---

*As of December 1967

It is clear that public school districts are the largest single employers of adult basic education teachers trained in the Region VIII National Summer Institutes.

The type of assignment held in 1967-68 by those respondents who were employed and who provided data on their employment is shown in Table 7. In some cases respondents indicated that they were teaching specific subject matter courses while others used the more general category of adult basic education classes. If we combine the "core" adult basic education subjects; reading, language, arts and arithmetic with the adult basic education category we find that of the 1966 participants responding to this question, 21, or 53.8 percent are teaching basic educational skills. For the 1967 participants there are also 21 individuals amounting in this instance to 46.7 percent. For both summer institutes the total is 42 out of 84 respondents or 50.0 percent with the other half carrying out a variety of teaching and administrative positions during the academic year 1967-68.

TABLE 7

EMPLOYMENT TO TEACH BY SUBJECT MATTER AREAS
IN 1967-68*

SUBJECT MATTER	SUMMER INSTITUTES					
	1966		1967		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Arithmetic	2	5.1	1	2.2	3	3.6
Language Arts	3	7.7	7	15.6	10	11.9
Reading	11	28.2	9	20.0	20	23.7
Science	0	---	0	---	0	---
Social Science	1	2.6	1	2.2	2	2.4
G.E.D.	3	7.7	1	2.2	4	4.8
A.B.E.	5	12.8	4	8.9	9	10.7
Administration**	8	20.5	17	37.8	25	29.8
Vocational	0	---	2	4.4	2	2.4
Other	6	15.4	3	6.7	9	10.7
Total	39	---	45	---	84	---

*As of December 1967
**Administrative positions in adult basic education programs

Of the 159 questionnaires received 12, or 7.5 percent of the individuals stated that they expected a teaching assignment later in the academic year 1967-68 while 69 or 43.4 percent stated that they did not have this anticipation.

Question 2 sought much the same data for the previous academic year, 1966-67. Table 8 shows the number and percent of respondents by summer institutes who stated that they had no adult basic education assignment during the academic year 1966-67. Table 9 shows the distribution by states of respondents of both summer institutes who had no assignment in adult basic education during 1966-67 and percentages based upon the total number of respondents from each state.

TABLE 8

NO ASSIGNMENT IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION
IN 1966-67

SUMMER INSTITUTES	NUMBER	%
1966	30	18.9
1967	12	7.5

TABLE 9

NO ASSIGNMENT IN ADULT BASIC
EDUCATION IN 1966-67 BY STATES*

States	Summer Institutes			
	1966		1967	
	Number	%	Number	%
Colorado	6	18.7	0	----
Idaho	4	50.0	2	40.0
Montana	6	6.2	1	6.7
Utah	2	5.4	0	----
Wyoming	9	7.4	2	40.0
Other States	3	60.0	7	21.9

*Percentages based on the number of respondents from each state.

Table 10 shows the data on employment during 1966-67 by type of agency for both summer institutes. The type of assignment held in 1966-67 is shown in table 11 for those respondents who provided data on their employment for that year.

TABLE 10

EMPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF AGENCY
In 1966-67

AGENCY	Summer Institute					
	1966		1967		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Bureau of Indian Affairs	0	---	1	2.0	1	1.0
Bureau of Prisons	0	---	5	10.2	5	5.2
Community/Junior College	4	8.5	0	---	4	4.2
College	2	4.3	4	8.2	6	6.3
University	0	---	0	---	---	---
Migrant Council	0	---	0	---	---	---
O.E.O.	3	6.4	3	6.1	6	6.3
Hospital	0	---	0	---	0	---
Publishing Company	0	---	1	2.0	1	1.0
School District	37	78.7	31	63.3	68	70.8
State Education Agency	0	---	4	8.2	4	4.2
M.D.T.A.	1	2.1	0	---	1	1.0
Total	47	---	49	---	96	---

TABLE 11

EMPLOYMENT TO TEACH BY SUBJECT MATTER AREAS IN 1966-67

SUBJECT MATTER	Summer Institutes					
	1966		1967		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Arithmetic	8	14.8	1	2.2	9	9.0
Language Arts	7	13.0	10	21.7	17	17.0
Reading	14	25.9	12	26.1	26	26.0
Science	0	---	0	---	0	---
Social Science	0	---	1	2.2	1	1.0
G.E.D.	2	3.7	0	---	2	2.0
A.B.E.	11	20.4	4	8.7	15	15.0
Administration*	7	13.0	10	21.7	17	17.0
Vocational	0	---	3	6.5	3	3.0
Other	5	9.3	5	10.9	10	10.0
Total	54	---	46	---	100	---

*Administrative positions in adult basic education programs.

If for Table 11 we combine the number of individuals who taught the "core" adult basic education courses with those who indicated that their assignemnt was in ABE we find that of the 1966 respondents 40, or 74.1 percent are teaching basic educational skills. For the 1967 respondents there are 27 individuals acccounting for 58.7%. For both summer institutes the total is 67 or 67.0%.

Question 3 asked the participants to indicate whether they had an opportunity to assist in the training of other teachers of adult basic education classes and to describe the activities in which they had been able to participate. Table 12 shows the distribution and percentages of yes and no responses for participants in both summer institutes.

TABLE 12

Distribution of Responses to Question 3 ("Have you had an opportunity to assist in the training of other teachers of adult basic education?") by summer institutes.

Summer Institute	Yes		No		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1966	26	16.4	61	38.4	3	1.8
1967	39	24.5	28	17.6	2	1.3
Total	65	56.0	89	40.9	5	3.1

Of the 65 who indicated that they had participated in the training of other teachers of adult basic education classes, 64 gave some indication of the type of activity. Table 13 shows the numbers of respondents and percentages for each activity stated for both summer institutes.

TABLE 13

Frequency Distribution of Activities in Teacher Training Listed by Respondents

Activity	Summer Institute					
	1966		1967		Total	
	Number	% *	Number	% *	Number	% *
Administration	2	8.0	0	---	2	3.1
Consultation	1	4.0	2	5.1	3	4.7
Counseling	3	12.0	2	5.1	5	7.8
In-Service Training	3	12.0	6	15.4	9	14.1
Teacher Supervision	1	4.0	1	2.6	2	3.1
Teacher Training	7	28.0	11	28.2	18	28.1
Teaching	1	4.0	0	---	1	1.6
Workshops	6	24.0	13	33.3	19	29.7
Curriculum Preparation	1	4.0	4	10.3	5	7.8
Total	25	---	39	---	64	---

*Percentages based on total number of responses per column.

Question 4 asked the participants if they would be willing to assist in the training of other teachers of Adult Basic Education classes. Table 14 shows the distribution of responses on the 159 questionnaires returned.

TABLE 14

Distribution of Responses to Question 4 ("Would you be willing to assist in the training of other teachers of adult basic education in your area?") by Summer Institutes

Summer Institute	Yes		No		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1966	75	47.2	13	8.2	2	1.3
1967	60	37.7	9	5.6	0	---
Total	135	84.9	22	13.8	2	1.3

Question 5 asked if the participants felt the need for additional training in adult basic education. Table 15 shows the distribution of responses while Table 16 shows the frequency and percent of yes responses for each state based upon the total number of respondents from each state.

TABLE 15

Distribution of Response to Question 5 ("Do you feel you should have additional training in adult basic education?") by Summer Institutes.

Summer Institutes	Yes		No		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1966	67	42.2	20	12.6	3	1.9
1967	54	33.9	15	9.4	0	---
Total	121	76.1	35	22.0	3	1.9

TABLE 16

Distribution of "yes" Responses to Question 5
by States and by Summer Institute

States	Summer Institute								
	1966			1967			Total		
	Total Respon-dents	Number Yes	% * Yes	Total Respon-dents	Number Yes	% * Yes	Total Respon-dents	Number Yes	% * Yes
Colorado	32	23	71.9	15	12	80.0	47	35	74.5
Idaho	8	7	87.5	5	4	80.0	13	11	84.6
Montana	13	9	69.2	6	4	66.7	19	13	68.4
Utah	13	11	84.6	6	5	83.3	19	16	84.2
Wyoming	19	13	68.4	5	4	80.0	24	17	78.3
Other	5	4	80.0	32	25	78.1	37	29	78.3

*Percentages based on the responses by states

Question 6 asked the respondents to indicate subject matter areas which they felt should be the focus of future teacher training. The question was so worded that only those who had indicated an interest in additional training in adult basic education would suggest areas of emphasis. Table 17 is a tabulation of the frequencies of topic areas suggested by 60 respondents who were in the 1966 summer institute and 53 in the 1967 program.

TABLE 17

Distribution of suggested subject matter areas
for future adult basic education teacher training
by Summer Institute

Subject Matter Area	Summer Institute					
	1966		1967		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Student Needs	4	4.4	3	4.3	7	4.4
Admn & Supervision	4	4.4	1	1.5	5	3.1
Arithmetic	4	4.4	1	1.5	5	3.1
Counsel & Testing	3	3.4	6	8.7	9	5.7
Instruc. Materials	7	7.8	4	5.8	11	6.9
English as a Second Language	1	1.1	5	7.2	6	3.8
Health	0	---	1	1.5	1	.6
Home and Family	2	2.2	0	---	2	1.3
Language Arts	4	4.4	4	5.8	8	5.0
Reading	12	13.3	8	11.5	20	12.6
Recent Developments in ABE	5	5.6	2	2.9	7	4.4
Social Science	1	1.1	1	1.5	2	1.3
Student Attitudes	5	5.6	8	11.5	13	8.2
Teacher Training	3	3.4	1	1.5	4	2.5
Teaching Methods	7	7.8	5	7.2	12	7.6
Science	1	1.1	0	---	1	.6
Vocational Educ.	0	---	1	1.5	1	.6
Audio-Visual	0	---	1	1.5	1	.6
Community Development	0	---	1	1.5	1	.6
No Response	27	30.0	16	23.1	43	27.1

Question 7 asked for preferences in format for future adult basic education teacher training programs. Two possibilities (summer institutes and in-service training during the academic year) were suggested with the opportunity for the respondent to write in other alternatives for which he might have some preference. Table 18 shows the distribution of first and second choices made by 124 different respondents.

TABLE 18

Distribution of first and second choices
for preferred format for additional teacher training
in adult basic education

Format	SUMMER INSTITUTE											
	1966				1967				Total			
	First Choice		Second Choice		First Choice		Second Choice		First Choice		Second Choice	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Summer Institute	55	61.1	0	---	49	71.0	0	---	104	65.4	0	---
In-Service	12	13.3	12	13.3	5	7.2	7	10.1	17	10.7	19	12.0
Seminar	1	1.1	0	---	0	---	1	1.5	1	.6	1	.6
Refresher Course	0	---	1	1.1	1	1.5	0	---	1	.6	1	.6
Conference	0	---	0	---	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	.6	1	.6
Research	0	---	1	1.1	0	---	0	---	0	---	136	.6
No Response	22	24.5	76	84.5	13	18.8	60	86.9	35	22.1		85.6

CONCLUSIONS

Employment in teaching adult basic education classes is one way of estimating the impact of the National Summer Institutes upon the adult basic education program in Region VIII.

Employment of 1967 participants was five times as great in 1967-68 as for the 1966 participants during the same academic year. In addition, employment in 1966-67 for 1967 participants was more than twice the employment of 1966 participants during the earlier academic year. This tends to indicate that summer institute participation has not been generally regarded as a prerequisite for teaching. It remains to be determined why the 1966 participants were under employed in adult basic education classes during both academic years.

There tends to be considerable variation among states in the non-employment of participants in both summer institutes for both academic years for which data was sought. Montana, Utah and Wyoming fared best in 1966-67 (Table 9) with only a relatively small percentage of respondents from the 1966 institute from these states indicating no teaching assignment. However, these percentages increase sharply for 1967-68. Colorado which showed no unemployed respondents from the 1967 summer institute during the previous academic year showed over 13% in the academic year 1967-68. Utah respondents who attended the 1967 summer institute did not indicate any unemployment in adult basic education in either academic year, a relatively low figure for the 1966 participants in

academic year 1967-68.

It would be very difficult to draw any conclusions in which one might have confidence from the data on employment in adult basic education by states. Certainly differences in program development and the utilization of available funds in each state have had their effect as well as the issue of whether participation in formalized training is seen as a prerequisite for employment by local directors. In general, however, it is probably safe to say that employment opportunities for 1967 participants have been much better than they were for the participants in the 1966 summer institute and that the field of adult basic education does experience some loss of teachers over time.

During the academic years 1966-67 and 1967-68 the public school districts of Region VIII accounted for 69.6 of all employment in teaching adult basic education classes as reported by the respondents. It is interesting to note the variety of agencies employing former participants. To some extent, however, some of this employment is in areas other than teaching adult basic education classes. Certainly the one respondent indicating employment by a publishing house is not teaching. In fact this particular individual is working in the area of commercially produced instructional materials for adult basic education. In addition some questions might be raised about all of the employment indicated in the responses in relation to its being confined solely to grades 1-8. Table 7 & 9 clearly indicate that the bulk of teaching in adult basic education is in the "core" instructional areas of reading, language arts and arithmetic. To some extent it becomes difficult to separate out teaching in subject matter areas such as science and social science because the material used in reading instruction may clearly fall into one of these categories. The question then becomes one of deciding whether the teacher is in fact teaching reading, or a natural or social science. As the question which elicited these responses was open ended the data we have is purely the result of the individual's perceptions of his primary teaching responsibility.

In addition it is interesting to note the relatively high incidence of teaching at the G.E.D. level. One may surmise that some of the teaching in the core areas was done at the G.E.D. level which would tend to lower the figure stated earlier relative to the proportion of teaching being done at the adult basic education level. Combined figures for both academic years give us at least a 3.3 percent of the employment of respondents in preparing students for the General Educational Development examination.

One of the objectives of the National Summer Institutes of 1966 and 1967 was to provide a pool of trained teachers who would be able to provide leadership in in-service training programs in their own communities and surrounding areas. The question of the extent to which this has happened is not answered by the data in tables 12 and 13 for there was no attempt in the questionnaire to quantify this activity. However, more than half of the respondents have assisted in training other teachers at some time during the two academic years. The problem of structuring in-service training programs for teachers of adult basic education classes at the present time is one that resides largely with local program directors. There are a number of sources of assistance including institutions of higher education and the state educational agencies and it appears that this assistance needs to be made readily

available to local directors with encouragement to utilize more fully the skills and knowledges of the participants in the National Summer Institutes. This is further supported by the data in table 14 which shows a strong willingness on the part of the respondents to participate in the in-service training of other teachers.

The need for specialized instruction in adult basic education was not completely satisfied by participation in a summer institute for those individuals who responded to the questionnaire. Over 3/4 indicated that they feel they should have additional training in this area. Reading constitutes the most frequently recurring subject matter area for further study. From the standpoint of the adult basic education instructional program, reading is at the very heart of the development of basic educational skills and these responses seem to indicate that training in the teaching of reading is recognized as having high priority.

Without question the format of the summer institute ranks high in the preferences of former participants. Nearly 2/3 of the respondents preferred it to local programs of in-service training and other on-campus and off-campus programs. Comments by former participants over the past 2 years have indicated that the concentrated instructional program provided by a variety of highly competent faculty coupled with library resources and the climate of the university setting contribute to making a very meaningful learning situation.

November 30, 1967

Mr. John Smith
103 Fifth Avenue
Denver, Colorado

Dear Mr. Smith:

As a follow-up to the Adult Basic Education Summer Institutes of 1966 and 1967 I will appreciate it if you will provide me with the information asked for in the following questions. I am enclosing a stamped self-addressed envelope for your convenience in replying.

1. What is your present assignment in Adult Basic Education? (School year 1967-68)

   ☐ None at present

   ☐ Employed by (School district or agency)_____

   To teach (subject matter and level)_____

   ☐ Anticipate an assignment later this year.

   ☐ Do not anticipate an assignment this year.

2. What was your assignment in Adult Basic Education last year? (School year 1966-67)

   ☐ None

   ☐ Employed by (School district or agency)_____

   To teach (subject matter and level)_____

3. Have you had an opportunity to assist in the training of other teachers of Adult Basic Education?

   ☐ Yes

   ☐ No

   If yes, briefly describe your activities.

4. Would you be willing to assist in the training of other teachers in Adult Basic Education in your area?

☐ Yes

☐ No

5. Do you feel you should have additional training in Adult Basic Education?

☐ Yes

☐ No

6. If your answer to 5 above is "yes" what areas of subject matter should the program focus on?

(Please be specific)

_____

_____

_____

7. If your answer to 5 above is "yes" would you prefer;

☐ Another summer institute?

☐ In-service training conducted in your area during the school year?

☐ Other? (Specify) _____

_____

I appreciate your supplying this information and extend to you my sincere wishes for continuing success in your educational activities.

Sincerely yours,

Vincent J. Amanna
University Staff Specialist
Adult Basic Education

VJA:mlz
Enclosure

ERIC Clearinghouse
APR 14 1969
on Adult Education